

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-18 are pending in the application, with Claims 1, 8 and 15 being the independent claims.

Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2002/0068586) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,343,216).

Claims 8-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. in view of Virtanen (U.S. Pat. No. 6,249,681).

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chun et al. and Kim et al. in view of Virtanen.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the Examiner states that Chun et al. in view of Kim et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, an automatic call connection method for a first mobile communication terminal, the method comprising the steps of storing call information for a setup call during initial call setup, *the call information stored by . . . a base station serving the first terminal*.

Chun et al. discloses a method of reconnection of a dropped call in a mobile communication system, the method comprising storing call information used during initial call setup, the call information stored “with the aid of a RAM in the terminal” (paragraph 0008). Chun et al. is silent about the capability of *the call information stored by . . . a base station serving the first terminal* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Kim et al. discloses a method of automatically reconnecting a dropped call in a mobile communication system. For storing the call information used during the initial call setup, Kim et al. advocates “with the aid of a RAM in the terminal for storing information on call origination and call termination” (col. 1 lines 45-47), but is silent about the capability of *the call information*

stored by . . . a base station serving the first terminal taught by Amended Claim 1.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 differs from Chun et al., Kim et al., or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 15 with respect to Chun et al., Kim et al., or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 with respect to Chun et al., Virtanen, or the combination thereof.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, all of the claims pending in the application, namely, Claims 1-3, 5-6 and 8-18, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicant

The Farrell Law Firm
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard
Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk